HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94142-1815

MARCH 27, 1999

HAROLD WEINBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

To begin with I want to thank you for sending me your manuscript, "Badly Reasoned", which thoroughly debunks the works of Fetzer, Twyman and the rest of his cohorts.

I must say after reading your entire manuscript (which I did in a few nights) your treatise represented for me what I would compare to several icebergs landing on the Titanic and sinking that ship to the bottom of the ocean. That is, in fact, how I described your work to a friend of mine who knows how I feel about the Fetzers and Twymans. I only wish your work could be published. The title may need to be changed but I can't think of another one at the moment.

And speaking about such personages as the Fetzers & Twymans lately I have been in correspondence with Max Holland. After my first letter to him and a delay on my part in replying to his reply he actually called me up on the phone wanting to know why I hadn't answered him. I explained to him in my next letter that I'd been involved in a car accident (no, again, I was totally ~~injured~~ uninjured although my car was totally wrecked). Perhaps Holland called me desiring an answer because he thought I'd be an easy pushover.

From his replies to me I'm convinced he knows

next to nothing about the photographic evidence and shows no true understanding about the medical evidence. When I pointed out the evidence for first shot striking JFK there has been no evidence on his part to reply to it (my debunking of his position was a seven page reply). He knew virtually nothing on Dr. Perry's position on an entry wound except that Holland chided me for not "knowing" that Perry "changed" his mind.

It looks as if Holland is willing to take the place of the new Posner in accepting the Warren Commission's conclusions. I'll bet Posner, himself, will write a glowing review of Holland's book when it comes out. (I asked Holland for a review copy so I could do a review on it but since he's not replied to my 7 page rebuttal this seems unlikely).

I note that in one of your previous letters you had mentioned that when Holland (together with Kai Bird) was over at your place he asked for your file on McCloy. I wonder if this was because he wanted to find out what arguments McCloy used to "persuade" Senator Russell about accepting the "magic bullet" solution. The reason I say this is that when I mentioned the Russell-LBJ conversation in which both said they <u>didn't</u> believe this "solution" Holland replied something to the effect that "wait until you see my book on this." Of course, I don't know what he'll have to say about McCloy but Holland will probably twist whatever McCloy did to his advantage. We'll have to wait and see, I guess.

By the way you mentioned (in your letter to to Baglivosi) that you had a "talking paper" prepared

by Russell for the 9/18/64 executive session and also that Cooper prepared an "oral history" relating to the single bullet theory. Is there any way I can obtain that Russell paper or the Cooper tape since I'd like to use it for my work on the first shot evidence? I know of no one other than yourself who has singled out these important pieces of information and they are extremely valuable. I will reimburse you for any costs involved—just let me know.

I also want to thank you for the copy of the Buglosi material. My guess is that Buglosi won't go much farther into Oswald's crypto background and where it could eventually lead to. If he goes to Newman you can count on it!

Now just a few comments on some of the Xerox copies I've included with this letter.

First, note the Fetzer review by a company known as "Open Court" situated in Chicago. I received their catalog in the mail.

Also, note the enclosures from the Barnes Review which includes stuff on the JFK case. The Barnes Review's first issue had an article on JFK written by Prouty. When I subscribed thinking I was getting that issue Barnes told me they were all sold out. Now I see they're promoting the absurd Michael Collins Piper concoction about the Israeli Mossad involvement.

Also note the Aguilar enclosures there is an article on the "Second Brain". But what I find interesting is that Gary is still hoeding to a first shot as being a missed shot (see 3rd column of his article where he puts in a parenthesis = "(The first shot is believed to have missed the motorcade altogether,

ricocheting off the street and slightly wounding a bystander)."

What I find puzzling is that Gary knows my position on this, he's seen me pointing to the Z-film (when I argued for first shot striking, he has a copy of my brief delivered on this at the Washington conference, and even he gave me a copy of a Don Olsen article proof of first shot striking (which utilized your work in that article). How Gary can still write this knowing all this make me wonder why he does this. I can remember very early when ~~I first~~ met him at one of the meetings early in our association and I argued that there was an entry wound on the neck stated three times at Parkland he disputed my claim. (I think he later came to realize I was correct the more he looked into the matter and so I never brought it up again). Now you can better understand why he is still defending the possibility of film alteration when it comes to the back of the head being intact. Of course, he will never come outright and say the film was altered. But he has taken me to task for not considering that the U.S. government could have altered the films his argument being that so much was altered, manipulated, lost or destroyed so why is it absurd to consider the U.S. government doing it? This will also help explain why he defends Mantik so much especially on the X-ray (lateral) showing (alleged) extreme whiteness. With so much else wrong with Mantik's analyses and arguments Aguilar will not argue about that whiteness within the confines of the films being authentic. (In a letter to me from D. Randy Robertson he stated to me that he can explain this (without relying on film alteration).

Aguilar's discussion of the "second brain" places him in great danger of coming close to saying that there were two brains (a hypothesis I find difficult to accept). My feeling is that setting out a complete (and reliable) track record of how, when and where the brain was removed and a precise chain of possession in this matter must be done before claiming two brains. It could seem a reckless procedure by Commission critics and even Max Holland (in a reply to Aguilar in the "Nation" magazine) said that Aguilar is creating a "fog machine." From the standpoint of those who think all critics are somehow loopy Holland may have scored a point with those who support the Holland zone of thinking, otherwise why would the "Nation" utilize him to "debunk" the critics.

Well, I must close now and get this into the mail. Write when you get the chance.

By the way a radio program (it doesn't reach a big audience) will have me speaking for two hours next Tuesday evening. You can be sure I'll mention your work and I do want to use the opportunity to show the damage the Fetzers, Trowmans, Mantiks and others do to our case.

Best,
Hal